**TSCC Regular Business Meeting**

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday, September 15, 2020**

**2:00 pm**

Commissioners Barringer, Norton, Wubbold and Quiroz were present as were Executive Director Craig Gibons, Budget Analyst Tunie Betschart all via telephone conference call.

Absent: Commissioner James Ofsink

Chair Barringer convened the TSCC Regular Meeting at 2:04.

**Minutes**

The minutes for TSCC July 22nd regular meeting and Portland Public Hearing were approved as presented.

**Budget Report**

Executive Director Gibons gave a brief explanation of the Budget report (See attached). He reviewed the graphs included in the handout saying the past 7 years staff has managed to stay below the maximum budget since he became the Executive Director. He explained that the uptick in the 2019-20 fiscal year was due to staff needing to telework from home due to COVID-19 pandemic. Most of this was enabling staff to access all TSCC data on the cloud without going through the server located in the office. This has proved very effective and reliable.

Commissioner Wubbold asked about the possibility of continuing to work in this manner. He asked staff their thoughts on how efficient this would be and how time is managed while teleworking verses working in the office environment. Executive Gibons said it was difficult to compare this experience to the past 5 years in the office due to family situations which complicated matters. He said that it was initially more difficult working at home but that he is becoming more efficient. He explained that part of the initial inefficiency was due to setting things up to work electronically in the absence of all the files and reports we usually have at hand in the office. Staff had to adjust to using electronic documents exclusively and learning to work with them efficiently; to gathering district documents in an electronic format; and to preparing and filing them so they are easily retrievable. Once this was accomplished it has become quite efficient. Tunie Betschart said she liked working in the office environment but also liked the fact that she can work as long as she likes enabling her to continue with projects. Being flexible and able to work from anywhere is a great advantage. Having in-person meeting and some actual working in the office is certainly good too.

**The Work Plan**

Staffing Plan

The Work Plan which was emailed previously was discussed. Executive Gibons explained the reason for the changes in item 5, Staffing Plan: Recruit for an administrative assistant was crossed off the list. (See attached). With teleworking from home now would be a very difficult time to bring a new assistant onboard and train them. At the current time this would be a challenge. After some discussion it was decided to change the Work Plan to say prepare a plan to add an administrative assistant describing components of position. Commissioner Norton brought up the need to solve Multnomah County’s objection to organizing TSCC’s own video conferences, whether it is for a one-on-one meetings or other business meetings. It was suggested to see what the Library and other entities within the county does to facilitate their meetings. The goal is to be able to hold virtual meetings when needed. Executive Director Gibons will ask around and see what they are doing. The history of TSCC was discussed.

Document History of TSCC

The discussion on documenting TSCC history the lead to a decision to create a working list of changes, why these changes came about, and what the milestones for TSCC have been with focus on the policy changes in Local Budget Law. Commissioner Wubbold volunteered to look at and help edit the list as we begin the process of making the achievable list.

Collecting Districts Mid-Year Budget Changes

The determination was made that these changes that are reported will be use as background when preparing the spring budget reviews and questions. If there are unusual changes staff may wish to ask for clarification but overall there will be no specific action needed when these reports are given to TSCC.

**Four Property Tax Levy Reviews for Upcoming Hearings**

Portland Public School District $1.208 Billion Bond Measure

In the interest of time, commissioners decided to go directly to discussing, editing, deleting and changing the questions previously prepared. After considerable discussion they decided on 11 issues for questions which Executive Director Gibons would rewrite, assign and email them and Portland Public School District Staff for consideration at the virtual public hearing to be held September 22 at 5:00 p.m. (See attached)

Multnomah County Library $387 Million Bond Measure

Next the commissioners discussed the County Library bond measure questions to be considered at the September 22 virtual public hearing. The end results were the 10 topics with questions Executive Director Gibons will rewrite and email to the commissioners and the district. (See attached)

Corbett School District $4 million Bond Measure

The final tax measure for discussion was on questions to be addressed at the Corbett School District’s virtual public hearing on the $4 million bond measure to be held September 23 at 6 p.m. At the conclusion of the discussion there were 6 focus areas for questions which Executive Director Gibons will rewrite, assign an email to the commissioners and the district staff. (See attached)

**Schedule Next TSCC Meeting**

Monday September 21, at 12:00 noon to review City of Portland tax levy hearing review and questions for the Public Hearing which will. Be held October 1, at 2:00 p.m.

**Adjourn**

There being no other business Chair Barringer adjourned the TSCC Regular Meeting at 4:04 p.m.

Attachments:

Budget Report dated June 30, 2020

Draft Work Plan Dated September 15, 2020

Hearing questions for:

Portland Public School District Tax Measure Hearing

Multnomah County Library Tax Measure Hearing

Corbett School District Tax Measure Hearing

Approved September 21

**Ballot Measure 26-211 Multnomah Library Facility Bonds**

**TSCC Hearing Questions**

1. (Margo) In early June at the budget hearing there was much discussion about whether the Library’s experience with the COVID-19 closure would prompt a re-think about design for the projects presented in the ballot measure. Chair Kafoury told us:” While the architects have some conceptual plans, to rebuild and reconstruct these libraries whether it's a brand-new library, a renovation, or a remodel or rebuild, they don't have the exact plans down.”
	* First: have any additional concepts emerged in this intervening time and, if so, what’s the new thinking? Has this new thinking been vetted with the community who participated so intensively in the original framing of the bond?
	* Second: Final design and changes in design always translate into cost, usually upward. The amount for this bond was set under the pre-Covid thinking. What flexibility is there in this bond to make significant design changes?
2. (David) When first approved by the Board. This was a $405 million bond measure. Why was the final amount reduced by $18 million? (Follow-Up: Why was the Capital Hill Library removed from the list?)
3. (James) What is the district doing to assure that the budgets for these projects are adequate? How large on the contingencies?
4. (Mark) The 2017 Library Framework Report recommends that the district “…prioritize early acquisition of land/sites for expanded libraries.” How does the spending plan for this bond measure address that recommendation? (Follow-up: how many new sites are you looking for? Is the district planning to replace leased facilities with owned facilities?
5. (Harmony) $23 million is allocated in this bond measure to the Outreach/Tech Service facility/function. What is that and who is served? (Follow-up-if not addressed: who is being outreached to? Will this program be expanding with this new facility?)
6. (David) The library district has been building a capital projects reserve, presumably for the type of expenditures in this bond measure. What are the plans for that reserve?
7. (Mark) What are the operations and maintenance costs of the new flagship library and how will the library district afford them? In general, what plans is the district making to pay for the staffing and operational costs of a larger library system?
8. (Margo) This ballot measure requires “annual audits.” Will these be performance audits or financial audits or both? Who will perform them? (Lots of follow-up possibilities here)
9. (Harmony) What are the board’s expectations of the independent bond oversight committee mandated by this bond measure?
10. (James) How is the board reaching out to the public about this bond measure and, with the current economic uncertainties, the pandemic, and the aftermath of the fires, how confident is the board that this bond measure will pass?

**September 16, 2020**

**Ballot Measure 26-215 Hearing Questions**

1. (David) The board originally considered three options for the size of this bond measure and the project list. The board ended up with a fourth option that was larger and contained more projects. What factors went into this decision and what public input did this choice reflect? How did this choice reflect public input?
2. (Harmony) What lessons has the board learned from the first two bond measures and how have those lessons impacted this bond measure. (Follow Up: how is the board addressing the voters about the cost overruns in the second bond measure?)
3. (Mark) What is the status of the Benson High School modernization? What work is yet to be completed? How will the work be impacted if this measure does not pass?
4. (Margo) As we understand it, this measure includes $60 million for planning, design, and phased construction of a Center for Black Student Excellence. This was not included in the three bond funding options released earlier this year. What are the origins of the Center and why was it included in the final package? Was the public involved in the decision to add this to the bond measure (Follow-up: What does it mean that the project funding of $60 million is for planning, design, and phased construction? Is that the full cost of this facility or just the portion in this bond measure? How will the center’s operating costs be funded? When will it be operational?)
5. (Harmony) Would you please elaborate on the purpose and location of the Multiple Pathways to Graduation Program and what construction is funded by this bond measure? (Follow up: Why is a central facility needed for this program? Will the district be transferring programs from other schools? How is it different from CTE space in other schools)
6. (James) In the 2017 bond measure, the district included $150 million for health and safety improvements to mitigate lead, asbestos, and radon hazards and upgrade alarm and sprinkler systems. What is the status of that work? Did that $150 million cover all the work needed? If not, how much more has been identified and what will it cost?
7. (Margo) This bond measure specifically calls out ADA accessibility and Special Education adaptive learning spaces and technology tools. Have these issues been addressed in prior bond measures? If, so, how, and what is planned for this measure?
8. (Mark) This bond measure includes funding for curriculum materials and computers for students. Please tell us what those components are and how does this expenditure balance with the need for new facilities?
9. (David) Have the bonds issued from the previous ballot measures generated a premium and, if so, how has it been used? Is the district anticipating a premium on these bonds? How will it be used?
10. (James) How is the board reaching out to the public about this bond measure and, with the current economic uncertainties, the pandemic, and the aftermath of the fires, how confident is the board that this bond measure will pass?

**Corbett School District Ballot Measure 26-220**

**Hearing Questions as of 9-16-20**

1. (David) First, we would like to know how school is going this year. How are you conducting school this fall? Were you able to start on time? What is your enrollment?
2. (Margo) Usually when we see a bond measure, it includes a specific list of projects and the cost of each project. We have not seen one for this bond measure and the accompanying state grant. Please tell us what projects will be paid for with this bond measure and what they will cost. What are the planned contingency levels? (Follow-ups if they don’t provide this information:
	1. The architecture firm that produced the long-term facility plan stated that the Middle school cannot be renovated. What is the district’s plan for this building should the bond measure pass?
	2. How will the district determine what will be on the project list? How will it determine the budget for each project? How large will the initial project contingencies be? Will the community be asked for its priorities and how will that be done?
	3. The district has purchased some land adjacent to the Corbett campus. Please tell us about this property: how big it is, what buildings are on it, their condition, what it might be used for in the future, and if any of the bond proceeds will be used for that property.
3. (Harmony) The district is now operating as a charter district. What does that mean in terms of this bond measure? Does the charter district replace the school district or is it a function of the district? What entity is asking the voters to approve this bond measure? (Follow-Up: Whose bonds are these?
4. (Mark) Has the board done any polling or community surveys related to the bond measure? Do the priorities in this bond measure reflect public input?
5. (David) Does the district plan to issue all the bonds at once? What are the time limits on the use of the funds? Are there strings on the state grant that will complicate the use of the fund or the sequencing of projects?
6. (James) How is the board reaching out to the public about this bond measure and, with the current economic uncertainties, the pandemic, and the aftermath of the fires, how confident is the board that this bond measure will pass?